

REMARKS

The applicant appreciates the finding that claims 5 and 12-14 are allowable.

The subject matter of claim 12 has been added to claim 1, with the exception that the mechanical structure that holds the multi-axial cable and compresses the ACE has been described a bit more broadly than was in claim 12. However, claim 1 is allowable because it now incorporates this “mechanical structure” element that is one point of distinction over the prior art, as the prior art does not disclose or suggest a mechanical structure that holds a multi-axial cable and compresses the ACE.

Claim 15 incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 5, and so is allowable.

Claim 18 is also allowable, as the prior art does not disclose this flex cable-to-flex cable electrical interconnection using ACE. Clearly, the arrangement in Morris requires an underlying “charge plate” which is rigid, and so does not suggest a flex-to-flex connection. Gordon is clearly distinguished from the claims as a whole, and does not add to the state of the art by any means. Gordon has an elastomer block 24, 26 which, as described at column 3 lines 28-36 and column 4, lines 42-45, and as shown in Fig. 2), the elastomeric blocks provide pressure to push the electrical contacts of the flex circuits 18 and 20 against those of board 22. Gordon thus does not disclose ACE material that forms the electrical interconnection, and indeed could not use ACE, as the electrical contacts in Gordon are directly connected (i.e. they are touching), and thus ACE between the contacts would interfere with this direct contact. As Gordon is not an ACE-based connector, there would be no motivation for one of skill in the field to look to Gordon for any suggestion whatsoever. Accordingly, the fact that Gordon discloses two flexible circuits is of no import to the consideration of the present claims.

Further, Morris is entirely directed at making a connection to a charge plate of an ink jet printer, and so does not suggest, and indeed could not be used to make a flex-to-flex connection through an ACE material.

As the references as properly combined under 35 U.S.C. 103 do not teach or suggest claim 18, that claim is also allowable.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been addressed or traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dingman
Reg. No. 32,729
Customer No. 28534